



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/441,822

11/17/1999

KIRK C. DANZL

021.12-0001

5081

22865 7590 05/22/2002

ALTERA LAW GROUP, LLC  
6500 CITY WEST PARKWAY  
SUITE 100  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55344

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, DUC MINH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/441,822

Applicant(s)

DANZL ET AL.

Examiner

Duc Nguyen

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22-52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22-52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2643

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 18 recites the limitation "the call report requestor" in line 6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371© of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 2643

4. Claims 18-20, 22-24, 26-27, 36-40, 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawson et al (6,381,306).

Consider claim 18. Lawson teaches a method for reporting call records of calls having associated call transaction data, comprising accessing the call transaction data (e.g., the statistics server generates certain statistics for the message records and stores the statistics to a database; see the abstract); verifying the validity of the call transaction data by performing statistical analysis to determine whether certain variables correspond to parameters (table 3 lists the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents. Therefore, it is inherently that the requestor/user/subscriber has to determine whether or not the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents are in the CDR) defined by a call report requestor (i.e., the subscriber); and if the call transaction data is valid, generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data wherein a subscriber selectively controls report formats and presentation parameters that define the manner in which the statistical report is presented to the subscriber (e.g., user can access server 129 from work station 132 to select and configure statistical reports; col. 6, ln. 18-19; a report application recalls the statistics from the database and presents the statistics in a reporting format configured by the user; see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 34-38; col. 6, ln. 18-19; table 3, col. 7, ln. 30-49). The examiner assumes that the requestor is the subscriber.

Consider claim 19. Lawson further teaches the call transaction data is identifiable to one of a plurality of call originators and wherein the statistic reports are generated for a report

Art Unit: 2643

requestor requesting a report for a predefined set of telephone line numbers (lines 11-13 of the abstract; col. 11, ln. 1-5) and wherein the verifying step is performed with respect to the call transaction data for each particular report requestor (i.e., table 3 lists the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents. Therefore, it is inherently that the requestor/user/subscriber has to determine whether or not the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents are in the CDR).

Consider claim 20. Lawson further teaches the verifying step is performed with respect to aggregated call transaction data (col. 9, ln. 31-55).

Consider claims 22-23. Col. 9, ln. 31 to col. 11, ln. 5 read on the limitations of claims 22-23.

Consider claim 24. Lawson further inherently teaches the established parameters vary from one call report requestor to another since the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents are defined differently from one requestor to another.

Consider claims 26, 39, 52. Lawson teaches a method for reporting incoming and outgoing calls having associated call transaction data, the calls being associated with one or more target line numbers (e.g., the reports indicate the statistical performance of the network providers for selected called or calling telephone numbers or for selected services; see the abstract), comprising accessing the call transaction data (e.g., the statistics server generates certain statistics for the message records and stores the statistics to a database; see the abstract); processing the call transaction data (col. 3, ln. 1-38); providing electronic access to the call transaction data (user

Art Unit: 2643

can access server 129 from work station 132 to select and configure statistical reports; col. 6, ln. 18-19); and facilitating dynamic report generation of the accessed call transaction data by a subscriber, wherein the subscriber is allowed dynamic, selective control of the report formats in which to present the call transaction data (e.g., a report application recalls the statistics from the database and presents the statistics in a reporting format configured by the user; see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 34-38; col. 6, ln. 18-19; table 3, col. 7, ln. 30-49).

Consider claim 27. Col. 11, ln. 6-13 reads on the limitations of claim 27.

Consider claim 36. Lawson's table 3 lists the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format and the definitions of the field contents. Lawson's table 2 further lists the fields of a preferred CDR format and definitions of the field contents. Therefore, it is inherently that the requestor/user/subscriber has to determine whether or not the user defined fields and/or the conventional fields of the preferred CDR formats and the definitions of the field contents are in the CDR.

Consider claim 37. Lawson further inherently teaches verifying the validity of the call transaction data on an overall level comprises comparing aggregate call transaction data (col. 9, ln. 31-55) against first parameters (table 1-2, 4) maintained for aggregate call transaction data.

Consider claim 38. Lawson further inherently teaches verifying the validity of the call transaction data on an overall comprises comparing call transaction data (col. 9, ln. 31-55) unique to the subscriber against second parameters (table 3) maintained for subscriber-specific call transaction data.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 40. Col. 6, ln. 7-19 reads on the limitations of claim 40.

Consider claim 51. Lawson further teaches providing business recommendation based on the processed call transaction data (col. 4, ln. 8-22).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al (5,896,445) in view of Shaffer et al (5,901,214) and Sant (6,169,896).

Consider claim 1. Kay teaches a method for reporting calls having associated call transaction data, the calls being from a call originator to a call recipient, comprising accessing the call transaction data, including at least one of a plurality of possible call originator location parameters (e.g., location of origin, zip code; see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 53-62; col. 8, ln. 19-31); correlating one or more of a plurality of possible call originator location parameters provided with the call transaction data with one or more of a plurality of stored parameters (col. 3, ln. 53-62; col. 7, ln. 58 to col. 8, ln. 10; col. 8, ln. 19-31).

Art Unit: 2643

Kay does not teach determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the call originator for each call based on an closet correlation of the stored location parameters and the call originator location parameters associated with the call transaction; and storing the approximate longitude and latitude.

Shaffer teaches determining an approximate longitude and latitude of the call originator for each call based on an closest correlation of the stored location parameters and the call originator location parameters associated with the call transaction (e.g., Shaffer teaches converting from the postal code (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude; col. 8, ln. 7-32; col. 11, ln. 26 to col. 12, ln. 26; col. 16, ln. 52 to col. 17, ln. 37; col. 24, ln. 20-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Shaffer into the teachings of Kay in order to provide benefits, such as improved connection efficiency.

Kay in view of Shaffer does not teach storing the approximate longitude and latitude.

Sant teaches storing the approximate longitude and latitude (col. 7, ln. 5-17, fig. 5, 8).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Sant into the teachings of Kay in view of Shaffer in order to better evaluate the different wireless networks throughout the varied terrain of the geographic area under test.

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 2. Kay further teaches generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data (see the entire abstract). Sant further teaches storing the approximate longitude and latitude of the call originator for each call (col. 7, ln. 5-17, fig. 5, 8).

Consider claims 3-4. Shaffer further teaches converting from the postal code of the call originator (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude; col. 8, ln. 7-32; col. 11, ln. 26 to col. 12, ln. 26; col. 16, ln. 52 to col. 17, ln. 37; col. 24, ln. 20-67).

Consider claims 5-6. Shaffer further teaches determining the location of a NPANXX (the area code) based on a V&H coordinate file (i.e., the longitude and latitude file).

Consider claims 7-8. Shaffer further teaches converting from the area code and exchange code to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 16, ln. 12-51; col. 38, ln. 26-59).

Consider claims 10-11. Shaffer further teaches converting from the postal code (zip code or extended zip code) to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 8, ln. 7-32; col. 11, ln. 26 to col. 12, ln. 26; col. 16, ln. 52 to col. 17, ln. 37; col. 24, ln. 20-67).

Consider claims 12-13, 15. Shaffer further teaches converting from the area code and exchange code to a corresponding longitude and latitude (col. 16, ln. 12-51; col. 38, ln. 26-59).

7. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson et al (6,381,306) in view of Walter (5,999,604).

Consider claim 25. Lawson does not teach the variables comprise the number of calls placed or received in a particular time period.

Art Unit: 2643

Walter further teaches the variables comprise the number of calls placed or received in a particular time period (col. 5, ln. 35 to col. 7, ln. 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Walter into the teachings of Lawson in order to provide several levels of services impact reporting, thus providing users with more versatile and detailed network management capabilities.

8. Claims 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson et al (6,381,306) in view of Fleischer et al (5,799,073).

Consider claims 28-30. Lawson further teaches the selectable table formats comprise tables providing information relating to at least one of call duration (time or transaction start-time of transaction end, see table 2); unanswered calls, busy signals (see table 5), and based on the calling party number and called party number one could figure out which is the most frequently called line numbers, most frequent callers, new callers, newly-called line numbers (see tables 2, 4, 6). Lawson further teaches a plurality of graph formats (col. 11, ln. 6-10).

Lawson does not clearly teach providing information relating to the most frequently called postal codes, most frequently called-from postal codes.

Fleischer teaches recording call related data in which zip codes and calls by zip codes are collected and stored (see fig. 7A-1-7B, 8A-D). Based on the zip code One can figure out

Art Unit: 2643

information relating to the most frequently called postal codes, most frequently called-from postal codes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Fleischer into the teachings of Lawson in order to determine the effectiveness of various promotional campaigns and/or obtain market data about their clientele, relative to their location, demographics and when the calls are placed.

9. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson et al (6,381,306) in view of Fleischer et al (5,799,073) and Thompson (5,109,399).

Consider claims 31-34. Lawson further teaches the selectable table formats comprise tables providing information relating to at least one of call duration (time or transaction start-time of transaction end, see table 2); unanswered calls, busy signals (see table 5), and based on the calling party number and called party number one could figure out which is the most frequently called line numbers, most frequent callers, new callers, newly-called line numbers (see tables 2, 4, 6).

Lawson does not clearly teach providing information relating to the most frequently called postal codes, most frequently called-from postal codes.

Fleischer teaches recording call related data in which zip codes and calls by zip codes are collected and stored (see fig. 7A-1-7B, 8A-D). Based on the zip code One can figure out

Art Unit: 2643

information relating to the most frequently called postal codes, most frequently called-from postal codes.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Fleischer into the teachings of Lawson in order to determine the effectiveness of various promotional campaigns and/or obtain market data about their clientele, relative to their location, demographics and when the calls are placed.

Lawson in view of Fleischer does not teach a plurality of selectable map formats.

Thompson teaches displaying a geographic map (fig. 4; col. 3, ln. 1-41) having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference (col. 3, ln. 1-41) related to each call reflected in the call transaction data (ANI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thompson into the teachings of Lawson in view of Fleischer in order to provide the best ways for determining location information by means of a visual display.

10. Claims 41-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson et al (6,381,306) in view of Brandt et al (6,377,993).

Consider claim 41. Lawson does not clearly teach distributing the call transaction data via the Internet.

Art Unit: 2643

Brandt teaches distributing call transaction data via the Internet (see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 36-61).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Brandt into the teachings of Lawson in order to enable customers to access their own relevant data information timely, rapidly and accurately through the GUI client interface.

Consider claim 42. Lawson further teaches allowing the subscriber to dynamically select at least one of a plurality of the report formats in which to present the call transaction data (e.g., a report application recalls the statistics from the database and presents the statistics in a reporting format configured by the user; see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 34-38; col. 6, ln. 18-19; table 3, col. 7, ln. 30-49), wherein the plurality of the report formats comprises at least a table, a graph, map (col. 11, ln. 8-10).

Consider claim 43. Lawson's col. 11, ln. 6-13 reads on the limitations of claim 43.

Consider claim 44. Lawson teaches allowing the subscriber to dynamically modify presentation parameters comprises allowing the subscriber to dynamically identify a date range of the call transaction data (database 206 are configured to hold a week's worth of statistical data; col. 9, ln. 40-55).

Consider claim 45. Lawson further teaches allowing the subscriber to dynamically identify one or more fields of the call transaction data which is to be presented pursuant to the selected report format (table 3 lists the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format).

Art Unit: 2643

Consider claim 46. Lawson further teaches allowing the subscriber to dynamically identify mathematical calculations (i.e., statistical calculation) of one or more corresponding fields of the call transaction data which is to be presented pursuant to the selected report format (table 3 lists the user defined fields of a preferred CDR format).

Consider claim 47. Lawson further teaches allowing the subscriber to identify collective totals of one or more corresponding fields of the call transaction data which is to be presented pursuant to the selected report format (see table 5).

Consider claim 48. Lawson further teaches allowing the subscriber to identify averages of one or more corresponding fields of the call transaction data which is to be presented pursuant to the selected report format (see table 5, average call set-up time, average call hold-time, and average answer seizure ratio).

11. Claims 49-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson et al (6,381,306) in view of Thompson (5,109,399).

Consider claim 49-50. Lawson does not teach the plurality of the report formats comprises at least a visual representation of a geographic map that identifies the approximate geographic origin of the calls made to the call recipient by the one or more call originators.

Thompson teaches displaying a geographic map (fig. 4; col. 3, ln. 1-41) having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference (col. 3, ln. 1-41) related to each call reflected in the call transaction data (ANI).

Art Unit: 2643

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thompson into the teachings of Lawson in order to provide the best ways for determining location information by means of a visual display.

12. Claims 9, 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kay et al (5,896,445) in view of Thompson (5,109,399).

Consider claim 9. Kay does not teach displaying a geographic map having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference related to each call reflected in the call transaction data.

Thompson teaches displaying a geographic map (col. 3, ln. 1-41) having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference (col. 3, ln. 1-41) related to each call reflected in the call transaction data (ANI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thompson into the teachings of Kay in order to provide the best ways for determining location information by means of a visual display.

Consider claim 35. Kay teaches a method for reporting calls having associated call transaction data (e.g., originating and terminating numbers; location of origin, zip code; see the abstract; col. 3, ln. 53-62; col. 8, ln. 19-31), the calls being from a call originator to a call recipient, comprising accessing the call transaction data (fig. 6C; col. 8, ln. 19-31); and determining an approximate geographical reference related to each call reflected in the call

Art Unit: 2643

transaction data (Zip code; col. 3, ln. 63 to col. 4, ln. 5; fig. 6C; col. 8, ln. 19-31). Kay further teaches displaying a plurality of variable telecommunication transaction attributes associated with each call (e.g., generating a statistical report related to the call transaction data; see the entire abstract).

Kay does not teach displaying a geographic map having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference related to each call reflected in the call transaction data.

Thompson teaches displaying a geographic map (col. 3, ln. 1-41) having indicia to identify the approximate geographical reference (col. 3, ln. 1-41) related to each call reflected in the call transaction data (ANI).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Thompson into the teachings of Kay in order to provide the best ways for determining location information by means of a visual display.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

13. Claims 14, 16-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### ***Conclusion***

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-52 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 2643

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duc Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-7527.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Kuntz, can be reached on (703) 305-4708.

**Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231


Art Unit: 2643

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 308-6306 or (703) 308-6296** (Group's Fax numbers)  
**(703) 746-7251** (Examiner's Fax number, only for proposed amendment)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

May 13, 2002

  
**DUC NGUYEN**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**